



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

one alleged to be an illegitimate posthumous child of a deceased workman to recover compensation for the death of the alleged father as a dependent under the English Workmen's Compensation Act, declarations by the deceased to the mother and to others, admitting that he was the father of the child and declaring his intention to marry the mother, were offered in evidence to prove paternity and dependency. *Held*, that the declarations are admissible. *Lloyd v. Powell Duffryn Steam Coal Co., Ltd.*, [1914] A. C. 733.

For a discussion of the results to which this decision seems to lead, see this issue of the REVIEW, p. 299.

EXECUTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS — RIGHTS, POWERS AND DUTIES — RIGHT OF RETAINER: PRESENT SCOPE OF THE DOCTRINE. — A and B, joint trustees, lost part of the trust funds by an improper investment. A died, appointing B and C his executors. C took A's place as joint trustee, and now claims the right to retain from A's estate the sum due the trust. *Held*, that he may retain. *In re Harris*, [1914] 2 Ch. 395.

A became bound to pay a certain sum to trustees, in trust for herself for life, and then for B, her daughter. She died thirty years after the obligation arose, without having paid the debt, and appointed B her executrix. B now claims the right to retain the sum due from A's estate. *Held*, that she may not retain for a debt due her as *cestui que trust*. *In re Sutherland*, 49 L. J. 490 (Chan. Div.).

In England an executor may retain from the estate the amount of a debt due to him. This right arose from the common-law rule allowing preferences to creditors of the estate and the consequent injustice if the executor were placed in a worse position than other creditors, through his inability to sue himself. *Woodward v. Lord Darcy*, Plowd. 184; *Crowder v. Stewart*, 16 Ch. D. 368. When the debt is due to another in trust for the executor, the trustee can bring suit and with the abolition of the executor's common-law right to prefer creditors, the necessity for retainer ceases. The second principal case seems correct. See, therefore, *Cockcroft v. Black*, 2 P. Wms. 298. Cf. *Thompson v. Thompson*, 9 Price, 469. It does not seem material that the claim arose after the testator's death. *In re Barrett*, 43 Ch. D. 70. In England, moreover, the executor may retain even if the claim was barred by the Statute of Limitations in the lifetime of the testator. *Stahlschmidt v. Lett*, 1 Sm. & G. 415. In America, the right of retainer exists in a few states, but has been generally abolished, or limited to solvent estates. See *Nelson v. Russell's Adm'rs*, 15 Mo. 356; *Miller v. Irby*, 63 Ala. 477. In states where the right still exists, the English rules are generally followed, except that, by the weight of American authority, an executor may not retain for a debt barred by the Statute of Limitations. *Hoch's Appeal*, 21 Pa. 280; *Rogers v. Rogers*, 3 Wend. (N. Y.) 505. If a legatee may plead the statute against a creditor when the executor does not, he should have the same right against the executor himself, and this feature of the American doctrine therefore seems preferable. See 22 HARV. L. REV. 452.

GIFTS — GIFTS *Mortis Causa* — GIFT OF DONOR'S OWN CHECK. — The testator drew a check for an amount greater than the amount of his deposit, and delivered it to the plaintiff as a gift *mortis causa*. The plaintiff now sues the executor, who had withdrawn the funds from the bank. *Held*, that the plaintiff may recover the amount of the deposit. *Aubrey v. O'Byrne*, 49 Nat. Corp. Rep. 302 (Ill. App. Ct., Oct. 8, 1914).

The negotiable instrument of a third party may be the subject of a valid gift *mortis causa*. *Clement v. Cheesman*, 27 Ch. D. 631; *Brown v. Brown*, 18 Conn. 410. Delivery of the instrument would carry with it an irrevocable power of attorney to enforce the obligation in the name of the donor. *Snell-*